arXiv:1401.0332v3 [physics.atom-ph] 8 Jan 2014

Relativistic Equation of Motion Coupled-Cluster Method: Application to the closed-shell atomic systems

Himadri Pathak*[1], B. K. Sahoo[2], B. P. Das[3], Nayana Vaval[1], Sourav Pal†[1],
[1] *Electronic Structure Theory Group, Physical Chemistry Division, CSIR-National Chemical Laboratory, Pune, 411008, India*
[2] *Theoretical Physics Division, Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad, 380009, India and*
[3] *Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics Group, Indian Institute of Astrophysics, Bangalore-560034, India*

We report our successful implementation of the full fledged relativistic equation of motion coupled cluster (EOMCC) method. This method is employed to compute the principal ionization potentials (IPs) of closed-shell rare gas atoms, He-like ions, Be-like ions along with Na^+, Al^+, K^+, Be, and Mg. Four component Dirac spinors are used in the calculations and the one and two electron integrals are evaluated using the Dirac Coulomb Hamiltonian. Our results are in excellent agreement with those available measurements, which are taken from the National Institute of Science and Technology database (NIST). We also present results using the second order many-body perturbation theory (MBPT(2)) and random phase approximation (RPA) in the EOMCC framework. These results are compared with those of EOMCC at the level of single and double excitations in order to assess the role of the electron correlation effects in the intermediate schemes considered in our calculations .

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

High precision calculations of the spectroscopic properties of heavy atomic and molecular systems are challenging due to the complex interplay between relativistic and correlation effects [1]. However, with the extension of several well established non relativistic many-body methods to the relativistic regime and the recent advances in high performance computing techniques, such calculations are no longer insurmountable. Studies of atomic parity non-conservation (PNC) and permanent electric dipole moments (EDMs) due to the violation of parity and time reversal symmetries [2, 3], requirement of very accurate atomic properties for the precise estimate of systematic effects in the atomic clock experiments [4–6], determination of nuclear moments [7], calculations of sensitive coefficients to probe the variation of the fine structure constant [8–10] etc. require the development of powerful relativistic many-body methods. The spectra of multi-charged ions are of immense interest in many areas of physics; particularly in x-ray space astronomy, plasma physics and laser physics [11, 12]. Accurate values of ionization potentials (IPs), double ionization potentials (DIPs), and excitation energies (EEs), especially from the deep core orbitals, are required for setting up the probe and its tunability of the ionizing beam in experiments like e-2e, e-3e, γ-2e, double Auger decay etc [13, 14].

Among the various wave function based methods, the coupled-cluster (CC) theory within the singles and doubles (CCSD) approximation is the most elegant way of calculating energy or energy differences of atoms and molecules in the ground state as well as in the excited states [15]. Green's function and propagator techniques [16, 17] are the two traditional approaches to calculate direct energy differences. In the propagator approaches, the ground and excited states are treated simultaneously and due to the cancellation of common correlation effects, these approaches provide satisfactory results of these energy differences in a direct manner. In the CC domain, the Fock space multi-reference CC (FSMRCC) [18–24] and the EOMCC method [25–27] are the two most familiar variants for the calculation of direct energy differences. Many non-relativistic calculations of IPs, and EEs both in the FSMRCC [28] and EOMCC [29–31] frameworks are available, but their relativistic counterparts are far fewer for the former case and none for the latter.

Relativistic calculations are necessary for the spectral properties of heavy atoms and molecules as well as for highly stripped heavy ions. It is therefore desirable in such cases to have a theory which can simultaneously treat the electron correlation and the effects of relativity on the same footing as they are non-additive in nature. Kaldor and coworkers were the first to develop a relativistic coupled-cluster theory for this purpose. They applied the relativistic FSMRCC method to atoms as well as molecules. [32–35]. The effective Hamiltonian formalism of the FSMRCC theory, based on the Bloch equation, acts within a model space [36, 37]. It uses a common vacuum with respect to which holes and particles are defined. The holes and particles are further classified into active and inactive depending on the requirements of the problem. While an increase in the size of the model space can target more states, it can lead to convergence problems, which is well known in the literature as the intruder state problem [38, 39]. The EOMCC method is basically single reference in nature and is closely related to the CC linear response theory (CCLRT) [40–42]. Chaudhuri et al. had applied the relativistic CCLRT to the ionization

*h.pathak@ncl.res.in
†s.pal@ncl.res.in

TABLE I: The α_0 and β parameters of the even tempered basis used in calculations.

Atom	s		p		d		f		g	
	α_0	β	α_0	β	α_0	β	α_0	β	α_0	β
He	0.00075	2.075	0.00155	2.080	0.00258	2.180	0.00560	2.300	0.00765	2.450
Li	0.00750	2.075	0.00755	2.070	0.00758	2.580	0.00760	2.600	0.00765	2.650
Be	0.00500	2.500	0.00615	2.650	0.00505	2.550	0.00500	2.530	0.00480	2.500
Ne	0.00753	2.075	0.00755	2.070	0.00758	2.580	0.00800	2.720	0.00800	2.720
Na	0.00250	2.210	0.00955	2.215	0.00700	2.750	0.00710	2.760	0.00715	2.765
Mg	0.02950	1.630	0.09750	1.815	0.00750	2.710	0.00780	2.730	0.00800	2.750
Ar	0.09850	1.890	0.00720	2.965	0.00700	2.700	0.00700	2.690	0.00700	2.696
K	0.00550	2.250	0.00995	2.155	0.00690	2.550	0.00700	2.600	0.00700	2.600
Kr	0.00020	2.022	0.00720	2.365	0.00700	2.550	0.00700	2.695	0.00700	2.695
Xe	0.00010	2.022	0.00720	2.365	0.00700	2.550	0.00700	2.695	0.00700	2.695
Rn	0.00010	2.280	0.00671	2.980	0.00715	2.720	0.00720	2.710	0.00720	2.695

problem [43]. Hirata and co-workers [44] had employed the relativistic EOMCC method using two component valence pseudo-spinors alongwith a relativistic effective core potential (RECP) which was supplemented by the spin-orbit interaction [45]. The approach of Hirata and coworkers clearly lacks a rigorous description of the relativistic effects, which can be taken into account by using four component single particle wave functions and the Dirac Coulomb Hamiltonian.

In the present work, we consider the EOMCC method in the four component relativistic framework within the singles and doubles approximation (EOM-CCSD method) to calculate IPs by removing one electron from a closed-shell atomic system. This EOMCC method for the ionization problem is size consistent, and is equivalent to the (0,1) sector of the FSMRCC theory [46, 47]. It is capable of providing the principal as well as shake up IP values. The (0,1) sector FSMRCC theory does not address the shake-up states. Though the EOM-CCSD method is a size extensive method for the principal valence sector [48, 49], it is not so for the shake-up states. The error due to the size extensivity is reduced due to the presence of the two hole-one particle (2h-1p) block. Being an eigenvalue problem, it is not affected by numerical instabilities due to the intruder states, which are very common in the FSMRCC method, do not arise. Two intermediate calculations are employed to assess the effects of electron correlation. We refer these as EOM-MBPT(2) and EOM-RPA methods. The scheme named EOM-MBPT(2) uses a first order perturbed ground state wave function which corresponds to MBPT(2) energy as ground state energy and in the scheme EOM-RPA, the EOM matrix elements are constructed in the one-hole (1h-0p) space.

This paper is organized as follows. A brief discussion of the relativistic method used to obtain the single particle orbitals is presented in Sec. II. This is followed by a description of the EOMCC theory of the ionization problem and the computational details are presented in Sec. III. In Sec. IV, we give our results and discuss them before making our concluding remarks in Sec V. Unless stated otherwise we have used atomic units (a.u.) through out the paper.

II. GENERATION OF RELATIVISTIC ORBITALS

The four component DC Hamiltonian used to evaluate the atomic integrals is given by

$$H = \sum_i \left[c\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}_i + (\beta_i - 1)c^2 + V_{nuc}(r_i) + \sum_{j>i} \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i$ and β_i are the usual Dirac matrices, $V_{nuc}(r_i)$ is the nuclear potential and $\frac{1}{r_{ij}} = \frac{1}{\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j}$ is the electron-electron repulsion potential. Subtraction of the identity operator from β means that the energies are scaled with reference to the rest mass energy of the electron. The nuclear potential is evaluated considering the Fermi-charge distribution of the nuclear density as given by

$$\rho_{nuc}(r) = \frac{\rho_0}{1 + e^{(r-c)/a}} \quad (2)$$

where the parameter 'c' is the half-charge radius as $\rho_{nuc}(r) = \rho_0/2$ for $r = c$ and 'a' is related to the skin thickness which are evaluated by

$$a = 2.3/4(ln3) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{and} \quad c = \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}r_{rms}^2 - \frac{7}{3}a^2\pi^2} \quad (4)$$

with r_{rms} is the root mean square radius of the nucleus.

In relativistic quantum mechanics, the four component single particle electron orbital is given by

$$|\phi(r)\rangle = \frac{1}{r} \begin{pmatrix} P(r) & \chi_{\kappa,m}(\theta,\phi) \\ iQ(r) & \chi_{-\kappa,m}(\theta,\phi) \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

where $P(r)$ and $Q(r)$ are the large and small components of the wave function and the angular functions are given

TABLE II: SCF energy (E^0_{DF}), correlation energies from the MBPT(2) ($E^{(2)}_{corr}$) and CCSD ($E^{(ccsd)}_{corr}$) methods along with the numbers of active orbitals from various symmetries taken in the calculations for different atoms.

Atom	No. of active orbitals					E^0_{DF}	$E^{(2)}_{corr}$	$E^{(ccsd)}_{corr}$
	s	p	d	f	g			
He	16	14	12	9	7	-2.8618	-0.0365	-0.0415
Li^+	15	14	10	9	8	-7.2372	-0.0395	-0.0430
Ne^{8+}	16	15	11	9	8	-93.9827	-0.0421	-0.0434
Na^{9+}	16	15	13	10	9	-114.4158	-0.0414	-0.0426
Ar^{16+}	14	11	11	10	8	-314.1995	-0.0409	-0.0417
Kr^{34+}	22	13	11	10	9	-1296.1641	-0.0237	-0.0240
Be	13	11	11	9	8	-14.5758	-0.0742	-0.0924
B^+	15	14	10	9	8	-24.2451	-0.0824	-0.1062
C^{2+}	15	13	11	10	9	-36.4251	-0.0924	-0.1215
N^{3+}	15	14	13	10	9	-51.1144	-0.1026	-0.1369
O^{4+}	15	14	12	10	9	-68.3143	-0.1089	-0.1487
F^{5+}	15	14	13	10	9	-88.0271	-0.1168	-0.1621
Ne^{6+}	16	15	13	10	9	-110.2559	-0.1237	-0.1744
Na^{7+}	15	14	11	10	9	-135.0042	-0.1266	-0.1829
Mg^{8+}	15	14	13	11	9	-162.2763	-0.1352	-0.1966
Al^{9+}	15	14	13	10	9	-192.0767	-0.1404	-0.2072
Si^{10+}	15	14	13	11	9	-224.4105	-0.1461	-0.2177
P^{11+}	15	14	13	11	10	-259.2833	-0.1513	-0.2278
S^{12+}	15	14	13	11	10	-296.7011	-0.1561	-0.2374
Cl^{13+}	15	14	13	11	9	-336.6703	-0.1606	-0.2466
Ar^{14+}	15	14	13	11	10	-379.1979	-0.1650	-0.2554
Kr^{32+}	16	15	14	11	10	-1593.0492	-0.2316	-0.3630
Ne	17	17	13	11	10	-128.6919	-0.3736	-0.3732
Na^+	17	15	11	10	9	-161.8958	-0.3691	-0.3715
Mg	20	14	11	10	8	-199.9350	-0.4074	-0.4174
Al^+	15	14	13	10	9	-242.1290	-0.3951	-0.4065
Ar	14	11	11	10	8	-528.6657	-0.6513	-0.6640
K^+	15	14	12	10	8	-601.3780	-0.6664	-0.6799
Kr	22	13	11	9	8	-2788.8492	-1.5247	-1.4622
Xe	23	13	12	9	7	-7446.8108	-2.1180	-2.0009
Rn	21	13	12	10	9	23595.8070	-3.7880	-3.4583

by

$$\chi_{\kappa,m}(\theta,\phi) = \sum_{\sigma=\pm\frac{1}{2}} C(l\sigma j; m-\sigma,\sigma) Y_l^{m-\sigma}(\theta,\phi)\phi_\sigma \quad (6)$$

for the Clebsch-Gordan (Racah) coefficient $C(l\sigma j; m-\sigma,\sigma)$, the normalized spherical harmonics $Y_l^{m-\sigma}(\theta,\phi)$, the Pauli two-component spinors ϕ_σ and the relativistic quantum number $\kappa = -(j+\frac{1}{2})a$ satisfying the condition for the orbital angular momentum $l = j - \frac{a}{2}$ with the total angular momentum j.

To generate the single particle orbitals, we use the relativistic Hartree-Fock (Dirac-Fock (DF)) Hamiltonian given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{DF} &= \sum_j [c\ \vec{\alpha}\cdot\vec{p}_j + (\beta-1)c^2 + V_{nuc}(r_j) + U(r_j)] \\ &= \sum_j h_0(r_j) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

TABLE III: Convergence pattern of ionization potentials of Be atom (in ev) as a function of the active orbitals using EOM-CCSD method.

No of active orbitals	IP values	
	1s	2s
91 (13s,11p,11d,9f,8g)	124.6463	9.3247
100 (14s,12p,12d,10f,9g)	124.6565	9.3248
109 (15s,13p,13d,11f,10g)	124.6620	9.3249
116 (16s,14p,13d,12f,11g)	124.6639	9.3249
118 (16s,14p,14d,12f,11g)	124.6639	9.3248

where h_0 is the single particle Fock operator with the DF potential

$$U|\phi_j\rangle = \sum_{a=1}^{occ} \langle\phi_a|\frac{1}{r_{ja}}|\phi_a\rangle|\phi_j\rangle - \langle\phi_a|\frac{1}{r_{aj}}|\phi_j\rangle|\phi_a\rangle \quad (8)$$

for all the occupied orbitals *occ* that leaves out contributions from the residual interaction $V_{es} = \sum_{j<l}\frac{1}{r_{jl}} - \sum_j U(r_j)$ which is incorporated through the EOMCC method.

To retain the atomic spherical symmetry property in our calculations, the matrix form of the Coulomb interaction operator using the above single particle wave functions are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\phi_a\phi_b|\frac{1}{r_{12}}|\phi_c\phi_d\rangle &= \int dr_1[P_a(r_1)P_c(r_1) + Q_a(r_1)Q_c(r_1)] \\ &\times \int dr_2[P_b(r_2)P_d(r_2) + Q_b(r_2)Q_d(r_2)] \\ &\times \frac{r_<^k}{r_>^{k+1}} \times Ang, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with the multipole k determined by $|j_a - j_c| \le k \le j_a + j_c$ and $|j_b - j_d| \le k \le j_b + j_d$. The angular momentum factor of the above expression is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Ang &= \delta(m_a - m_c, m_d - m_b)\sum_k \Pi^e(\kappa_a,\kappa_c,k) \\ &\times \Pi^e(\kappa_b,\kappa_d,k) d^k(j_c m_c, j_a m_a) d^k(j_b m_b, j_d m_d), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the coefficient $d^k(jm, j'm')$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} d^k(jm,j'm') &= (-1)^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\frac{[(2j+1)(2j'+1)]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2k+1)} \\ &\times C(jkj';\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2})C(jkj';-m,m') \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with $\Pi^e(\kappa,\kappa',k) = \frac{1}{2}[1 - aa'(-1)^{j+j'+k}]$ for $l + l' + k =$ even.

The DF single particle orbitals, $|\phi_{n,\kappa}(r)\rangle$s, with principal quantum number n and angular quantum number κ are initially constructed as linear combinations of Gaussian type of orbitals (GTOs) by writing

$$|\phi_{n,\kappa}(r)\rangle = \frac{1}{r}\sum_\nu \begin{pmatrix} C^L_{n,\kappa} N_L f_\nu(r) & \chi_{\kappa,m} \\ iC^S_{n,-\kappa} N_S \left(\frac{1}{dr} + \frac{\kappa}{r}\right) f_\nu(r) & \chi_{-\kappa,m} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

TABLE IV: Ionization potentials (IPs) of helium (He) like systems in eV using MBPT(2), RPA and CCSD methods in the EOM procedure.

Atom	MBPT(2)	RPA	CCSD	NIST [51]
Li^{+}	75.5517	77.1594	75.6399	75.6400
Ne^{8+}	1196.1770	1197.7308	1196.2113	1195.8078
Na^{9+}	1465.6073	1467.1611	1465.6401	1465.1344
Ar^{16+}	4123.5442	4125.1003	4123.5661	4120.6654
Kr^{34+}	17323.3995	17324.9869	17323.4104	17296.4200

where $C_{n,\kappa}$s are the expansion coefficients, $N_{L(S)}$ is the normalization constant for the large (small) component of the wave function and α_ν is a suitably chosen parameter for orbitals of different angular momentum symmetries and $f_\nu(r) = r^l e^{-\alpha_\nu r^2}$ is a GTO. For the exponents, we use the even tempering condition $\alpha_\nu = \alpha_0\beta^{\nu-1}$ with two parameters α_0 and β. It can be noticed in the above expression that the large and small components of the wave function satisfy the kinetic balance condition. The orbitals are finally obtained after solving the matrix eigenvalue form of the DF equation by a self- consistent procedure.

III. METHOD OF CALCULATIONS: EOM-CCSD

In the CC method, the ground state wave function of a closed-shell atomic system is defined as

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = e^T|\Phi_0\rangle, \tag{13}$$

where $|\Phi_0\rangle$ is the DF wave function. The excited states is defined as

$$H|\Psi_\mu\rangle \;=\; E_\mu|\Psi_\mu\rangle = E_\mu R_\mu|\Psi_0\rangle, \tag{14}$$

for a linear CI like excitation operator R_μ.

The operators R_μ commute with T as they are strings of quasi-particle creation operators (but not necessarily particle conserving). Pre-multiplying the above equation with the non-singular operator e^{-T} leads to

$$[\overline{H}, R_\mu]|\Phi_0\rangle = \Delta E_\mu R_\mu|\Phi_0\rangle, \tag{15}$$

where ΔE_μ is the energy change associated with the ionization process. and $\overline{H} = e^{-T}He^T - \langle\phi_0|e^{-T}He^T|\phi_0\rangle$ is a non-Hermitian operator. This approach is usually known as EOM method for the excitation operators in analogy to the Heisenberg's equation of motion. In the EOM-MBPT(2) and EOM-RPA methods, the matrix elements of the effective Hamiltonian $\overline{H}$ are replaced accordingly in the above equation.

In the EOM-CCSD method, the cluster operators are defined as

$$T \;=\; T_1 + T_2 = \sum_{i,a} t_i^a a_a^+ a_i + \sum_{a<b}\sum_{i<j} t_{ij}^{ab} a_a^+ a_b^+ a_i a_j \tag{16}$$

and

$$R_\mu \;=\; R_{1\mu} + R_{2\mu} = \sum_i r_i a_i + \sum_{i<j}\sum_a r_{ij}^a a_a^+ a_i a_j, \tag{17}$$

where i, j indices are used for the occupied and a, b are used for the virtual orbitals.

The matrix elements of the effective Hamiltonian for the present ionization problem are constructed in the (1h-0p) and (2h-1p) space and diagonalized to get the desired roots. The Davidson algorithm [50] has been implemented for the diagonalizing $\overline{H}$. This is an iterative diagonalization scheme through which eigenvalues and eigenvectors are obtained. It avoids computation, storage and diagonalization of the full matrix. The considered EOM-CC methods can be regarded as the diagonalization of the coupled cluster similarity transformed Hamiltonian in the CI configuration space.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To test the performance of our newly implemented four component relativistic EOM-CCSD method, we present numerical results of principal ionization potentials. The calculations are performed for the closed-shell rare gas atoms (He through Rn), beryllium like ions (B through Ar and Kr), helium like ions (Li, Ne, Na, Ar, Kr) along with Na^+, Al^+, K^+, Be and Mg. These calculations are compared with the results obtained using the EOM-MBPT(2) and EOM-RPA methods to assess the role of electron correlation. All these results are compared with those of the measurements, which are taken from the National Institute of Science and Technology (NIST)[51] database. For the construction of the single particle orbitals, we have used both even tempered (ET) and universal basis (UB) functions depending on the convergence of the results. For Be-like systems, we use UB basis with $\alpha_0 = 0.004$ and $\beta = 2.23$. We have used ET basis for other atomic systems. The corresponding α_0 and β parameters for ET basis for different atoms are given in Table I. The use of total number of orbitals generated at the SCF level is impractical in the CC calculations as the contributions from the high lying orbitals are very small in the present calculations owing to their large energy values, we consider only the orbitals that are significant of the calculations and they are termed as the active orbitals. In Table II, we present (SCF) energy which is our zeroth energy (E_{DF}^0) and the correlation energies from the MBPT(2) (E_{corr}^2) and CCSD (E_{corr}^{CCSD}) methods along with the number of active orbitals of different symmetries used in the calculations.

All the Gaussian type of functions generated at the SCF level are not important for the ionization potential calculations. To investigate this, we have studied the

TABLE V: Ionization potentials (IPs) of beryllium (Be) like systems in eV using MBPT(2), RPA and CCSD methods in the EOM procedure.

Ion	MBPT(2)		RPA		CCSD		NIST [51]	
	1s	2s	1s	2s	1s	2s	1s	2s
B^{+}	218.7753	24.6024	223.7170	25.4690	218.6932	25.1510	217.8827	25.1548
C^{2+}	340.5912	47.1763	345.3340	48.1961	340.5074	47.8838		47.8877
N^{3+}	489.5193	76.6082	494.3701	77.7833	489.3987	77.4732		77.4735
O^{4+}	665.8043	112.8779	670.6873	114.2098	665.6751	113.9003		113.8990
F^{5+}	869.6607	155.9937	874.4161	157.4809	869.5295	157.1714		157.1631
Ne^{6+}	1100.7242	205.9558	1105.5077	207.5972	1100.5835	207.2874	1098.7791	207.2710
Na^{7+}	1359.1193	262.7653	1363.9246	264.5608	1358.9780	264.2504	1357.1716	264.1920
Mg^{8+}	1644.9936	326.4618	1649.9248	328.4010	1644.8387	328.0902		327.9900
Al^{9+}	1958.6549	397.0176	1963.3552	399.1102	1958.5119	398.7986	1955.7950	398.6500
Si^{10+}	2299.5858	474.4895	2304.3242	476.7141	2299.4367	476.4017	2296.5894	476.1800
P^{11+}	2668.1363	558.8627	2672.8963	561.2228	2667.9846	560.9095	2664.7632	560.6200
S^{12+}	3064.3424	650.1586	3069.1229	652.6532	3064.1883	652.3391	3059.9469	651.9600
Cl^{13+}	3488.2444	748.3994	3493.0728	751.0246	3488.0867	750.7090		750.2300
Ar^{14+}	3941.3783	853.6104	3944.8161	856.3589	3941.4781	856.0432	3934.7226	855.4700
Kr^{32+}	16934.9486	3972.1671	16939.9718	3976.0698	16934.8134	3975.7297	16902.8643	3971.0000

convergence pattern of ionization potential as a function of basis set through a series of calculations. Be atom is chosen for the convergence study. We started our calculations with the 91 GTOs and gradually increased it to 118 GTOs. It is found that the IP value of the 2s orbital changes in the order of 1×10^{-4} when the number of basis functions increases from 91 to 118. The change is more for the 1s orbital and it is found to be 1.76×10^{-2}, which is also in the accuracy limit of 0.01%. As we are more interested in the valence ionization potential in the present work, an active space of similar basis set is sufficient to construct the orthogonal space for the inclusion of the correlation effects for all the systems without compromising the desired accuracy . The results are given in Table III.

We present the IP values of the helium like ions in Table IV. All the results are sub-one percent accurate and the result for Li^{+} is the most accurate and the least accurate is 0.15% for Kr^{32+}. This table shows that EOM-MBPT(2) results are always less than the EOM-CCSD whereas the EOM-RPA method over estimates them compared to the NIST values. Also, the differences in the results between the EOM-MBPT(2) and EOM-CCSD are less than those of EOM-RPA and EOM-CCSD. The reason why the EOM-RPA calculations may be over estimating is that the 2h-1p block, which is the major source of non-dynamical correlations, is not taken into account in this approach. The ground state wave function at the CCSD level is responsible for the major part of the dynamical correlations for which the EOM-MBPT(2) method seems to be a more valid approximation than the EOM-RPA method. This suggests that the non-dynamical correlations are also important for the calculations of the excited states. It is worth mentioning that the calculated EOM-CCSD IP results are larger than the NIST values for Ne^{8+} onwards and the deviation gets larger as the nuclear charge increases.

TABLE VI: Ionization potentials (IPs) of noble gas atoms in eV using MBPT(2), RPA and CCSD methods in the EOM procedure.

Atom	Orbital	MBPT(2)	RPA	CCSD	NIST [51]
He	$1s_{1/2}$	24.4560	26.1086	24.5802	24.5870
Ne	$2p_{3/2}$	21.4439	25.5832	21.4503	21.5642
	$2p_{1/2}$	21.5499	25.7096	21.5560	21.6613
	$2s_{1/2}$	48.5478	54.3474	48.6207	48.4746
	$1s_{1/2}$	872.6377	894.5355	872.3581	
Ar	$3p_{3/2}$	15.8278	18.0023	15.7951	15.7594
	$3p_{1/2}$	16.0152	18.2136	15.9817	15.9369
	$3s_{1/2}$	30.0706	36.3317	30.0656	29.2390
	$2p_{3/2}$	250.1420	261.8999	249.7786	
	$2p_{1/2}$	252.3757	264.2143	252.0114	
Kr	$4p_{3/2}$	14.1339	15.8840	13.9963	13.9996
Xe	$5p_{3/2}$	12.3916	13.7572	12.1294	12.1298
Rn	$6p_{3/2}$	10.8604	11.9900	10.5847	10.7485

In Table V, we give the IP results for the beryllium like systems. The $2s$ valence IPs of these systems are in excellent agreement with the NIST values. Our results for the $1s$ orbital match reasonably well with the NIST data. We find that the relative average deviation of the IP values of beryllium like systems ($\sim 0.03\%$) are less than helium like (0.05%) systems with reference to the the NIST data.

The results for the rare gas atoms are given in Table VI. For the Kr, Xe, and Rn atoms, we have calculated

TABLE VII: Ionization potentials (IPs) of Na^+, Al^+, K^+, Be and Mg in eV using MBPT(2), RPA and CCSD methods in the EOM procedure.

Atom	Orbital	MBPT(2)	RPA	CCSD	NIST [51]
Na^+	$2p_{3/2}$	47.1177	51.2511	47.1286	47.2863
	$2p_{1/2}$	47.3000	51.4556	47.3105	47.4557
	$2s_{1/2}$	79.9745	85.4228	80.0303	80.0741
	$1s_{1/2}$	1090.5239	1112.3845	1090.3169	
Al^+	$3s_{1/2}$	18.6480	19.1227	18.8248	18.8285
	$2p_{3/2}$	92.0692	97.8533	91.9647	91.7116
	$2p_{1/2}$	92.5141	98.3291	92.4092	92.1604
	$2s_{1/2}$	137.4759	143.6488	137.4202	
	$1s_{1/2}$	1582.3139	1605.2003	1582.0885	
K^+	$3p_{3/2}$	31.6687	33.9023	31.6434	31.6249
	$3p_{1/2}$	31.9497	34.2071	31.9232	31.8934
	$3s_{1/2}$	48.4814	55.1066	48.4795	47.8182
	$2p_{3/2}$	309.0471	320.6904	308.7081	
	$2p_{1/2}$	311.9336	323.6745	311.5935	
Be	$2s_{1/2}$	8.9442	9.6603	9.3247	9.3226
	$1s_{1/2}$	124.7175	129.7139	124.6463	123.6344
Mg	$3s_{1/2}$	7.5057	7.9519	7.6508	7.6462
	$2p_{3/2}$	58.3976	64.1697	58.2235	57.5603
	$2p_{1/2}$	58.6898	64.4875	58.5154	57.7983
	$2s_{1/2}$	98.3383	104.1001	98.2824	

only the outer valence IPs. The most accurate EOM-CCSD result we obtain among them is for Xe atom. The $2p_{3/2}$ valence ionization energy for the Ne atom differs from the experimental result by 0.1139 eV. The differences are 0.0357 eV, 0.0033 eV and 0.0004 eV for the Ar, Kr and Xe atoms respectively for their valence orbitals. The reason for these differences could be due to the possible double excitation character of the p orbitals and it decreases along the group. The IPs of the EOM-CCSD method predominantly account for contributions from the single excitations and to some extent from the double excitations. The discrepancies could be mitigated on inclusion of the triple excitations in the ground as well as in the EOM part which is computationally very expensive for the relativistic calculations and are not incorporated in the present implementation. The deviation is 1.54% for Rn atom, which is expected as higher order relativistic effects are non negligible for heavy elements and also due to the finite size of the basis sets.

In Table VII, we present the results for Na^+, Al^+, K^+, Be and Mg. The largest deviation is found in the $2p_{3/2}$ state of Na^+ which is about to be 0.33%. This could be due to the possible dominance of the double excitations. In the case of K^+ it is reduces to 0.05% and for Mg it is 0.06%.

V. CONCLUSION

The present work describes the four component relativistic implementation of the equation of motion coupled-cluster method at the level of single and double excitations for the ionization problem in closed-shell atomic systems. To test the reliability of this method, we have computed the ionization potentials of atomic systems from different groups in the periodic table. The calculations are performed using EOM-MBPT(2) and EOM-RPA besides EOM-CCSD to understand the role of electron correlation at all the three levels of approximation. The second order many-body perturbation method is found to under estimate the results, whereas the random phase approximation over estimates them. The EOM-CCSD results are in excellent agreement with the NIST data wherever available.

acknowledgements

HP, NV and SP acknowledge the grant from CSIR XI-Ith five year plan project on Multi-scale Simulations of Material (MSM) and facilities of the Center of Excellence in Scientific Computing at CSIR-NCL. HP acknowledges the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) for his fellowship. SP acknowledges grant from DST, J. C. Bose fellowship project towards completion of the work. A part of the computations were carried out using the 3T-Flop HPC cluster at Physical Research Laboratory.

[1] I. P. Grant, *Relativistic Quantum Theory of Atoms and Molecules: Theory and Computation* (Springer, New York, 2010).
[2] J. Engel, M. J. Ramsey-Musolf and U. van Kolck, Prog. Particle and Nuc. Phys. **71**, 21 (2013).
[3] J. S. M. Ginges and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rept. **397**, 63 (2004).
[4] M. Kallay, H. S. Nataraj, B. K. Sahoo, B. P. Das and L. Visscher, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 030503 (2011).
[5] B. K. Sahoo, R. G. E. Timmermans, B. P. Das and D. Mukherjee, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 062506 (2009).
[6] B. K. Sahoo, B. P. Das, R. K. Chaudhuri, D. Mukherjee, R. G. E. Timmermans and K. Jungmann, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 040504(R) (2007).
[7] C. S. Wood *et al.*, Science. **275**, 1759 (1997).
[8] J. P. Uzan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 403 (2003).
[9] D. K. Nandy and B. K. Sahoo, Phys. Rev. A. **88**, 052512 (2013).
[10] H. Chand, R. Srianand, P. Petitjean and B. Aracil, *Precision Spectroscopy in Astrophysics*, Proceedings of the ESO/Lisbon/Aveiro Conference held in Aveiro, Portugal, 1115 September 2006, pp. 101 (2008).
[11] J. D. Gillaspy, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **34**, R93 (2001).
[12] A. Chutjian, in *The Physics of Multiply and Highly Charged Ions*, (ed. F. J. Currell, Kluwer, London 2003).
[13] J. H. D. Eland, M. Tashiro, P. Linusson, M. Ehara, K. Ueda, and R. Feifel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 213005 (2010).
[14] James P. Cryan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 083004 (2010).
[15] R. J. Bartlett and M. Musiał, Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 291 (2007)
[16] J. Lindenberg and Y. Öhrn, *Propagators in Quantum Chemistry.* (Academic, New York, 1973).
[17] L. S. Cederbaum and W. Domcke, Adv. Chem. Phys. **36**, 205 (1977).
[18] I. Lindgren, Int. J. Quantum Chem. Symp. **12**, 33 (1978).
[19] M. Haque and D. Mukherjee, J. Chem. Phys. **80**, 5058 (1984).
[20] L. Z. Stolarczyk and H. J. Monkhorst, Phys. Rev. A **32**, 725 (1985).
[21] D. Mukherjee and I. Lindgren, Phys. Rep. **151**, 93 (1987).
[22] S. Pal, M. Rittby, R. J. Bartlett, D. Sinha, and D. Mukherjee, Chem. Phys.Lett. **137**, 273 (1987).
[23] S. Pal, M. Rittby, R. J. Bartlett, D. Sinha, and D. Mukherjee, J.Chem.Phys. **88**, 4357 (1988)
[24] B. Jeziorski and J. Paldus, J. Chem. Phys. **90**, 2714 (1989).
[25] H. Sekino and R. J. Bartlett, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **26**(S18), 255 (1984).
[26] R. J. Bartlett and J. F. Stanton, Reviews in Computational Chemistry. **5**, 65 (1994)
[27] J. F. Stanton and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **98**, 7029 (1993).
[28] D. I. Lyakh, M. Musiał, V. F. Lotrich, and R. J. Bartlett, Chem. Rev. **112**, 182 (2012).
[29] R. J. Bartlett, Comput Mol Sci, **2**, 126 (2012).
[30] M. Musiał, S. A. Kucharski, and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 1128 (2003).
[31] M. Musiał, and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **119**, 1901 (2003).
[32] E. Ilyabaev and U. Kaldor, Chem. Phys. Letters **194**, 95 (1992).
[33] E. Ilyabaev and U. Kaldor, J. Chem. Phys. **97**, 8455 (1992).
[34] E. Ilyabaev and U. Kaldor, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 137 (1993).
[35] L. Visscher, E. Eliav, and U. Kaldor, J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 9720 (2001).
[36] P. Durand and J. P. Malrieu, Adv. Chem. Phys. **67**, 321 (1987).
[37] V. Hurtubise and K. F. Freed, Adv. Chem. Phys. **83**, 465 (1993).
[38] T. H. Schucan and H. A. Weidenmuller, Ann. Phys. **73**, 108 (1972).
[39] U. Kaldor, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 6013 (1988).
[40] H. J. Monkhorst, Int. J. Quantum Chem., Symp. **11**, 421 (1977)
[41] E. Dalgaard and H. J. Monkhorst, Phys. Rev. A **28**, 1217 (1983).
[42] D. Mukherjee and P. K. Mukherjee, Chem. Phys. **39**, 325 (1979).
[43] R. K. Chaudhuri, P. K. Panda, B. P. Das, U. S. Mahapatra, and D. Mukherjee, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 246, (1999)
[44] S. Hirata, T. yanai, R. J. Harrison, M.Kamija, and P. D. Fang, J. Chem, Phys. 126, 024104 (2007).
[45] P. A. Christiansen and K. S. Pitzer, J. Chem. Phys. **73**, 5160 (1980).
[46] D. Sinha, S. K. Mukhopadhyay, R. Chaudhuri, and D. Mukherjee, Chem. Phys. Lett. **154**, 544 (1989).
[47] D. Mukhopadhyay, S. K. Mukhopadhyay, R. Chaudhuri, and D. Mukherjee, Theor. Chim. Acta **80**, 483 (1991).
[48] S. Kr Mukhopadhyay, R. Chaudhuri, D. Mukhopadhyay Jr, and D. Mukherjee, Chem. Phys. Lett. **173**,181 (1990).
[49] D. Mukherjee and S. Pal, Adv. Quantum Chem. **20**, 291 (1989).
[50] E. R. Davidson, J. Comput. Phys. **17**, 87 (1975).
[51] http://physics.nist.gov/PhysRefData/ASD/ionEnergy.html .